

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 5403 Case file # 95-HQ-1052305.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript not provided.

---

CRM 488



Was any other material reviewed?  Yes  No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letters dated 6-6-93 and 6-8-93

### Results of Review

File #: 95A-HQ-1052305 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q6, Q8-Q13, K3, K4, K6, K7

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
 Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
 Yes  No  Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?  Yes  No  Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95A-HQ-1052305

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are not readily interpreted. Some of the hairs recovered from Q items are marked as "NSFC".

Presumably, this means "Not Suitable for Comparison", but there is no documentation as to what makes these hairs unsuitable.

#2: Apparently, confirmation of the hair match was made by a second qualified (?) hair examiner.

Review completed at: 3:15 PM (Time), 11/07/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.50 hr

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts  
(Signature)

11/07/2001  
(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR